CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL
of the
PACIFIC
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/theology-monthly-review_1958-01_61_451

THEOLOGY

VOL. LXI JANUARY, 1958 No. 451

Editorial

THE new series "Studies in Ministry and Worship", to be published by the S.C.M. Press, has made an excellent start with Professor R. H. Fuller's *What is Liturgical Preaching?* (6s.). He distinguishes "liturgical preaching", i.e. preaching in the context of the eucharist which should correspond to the N.T. *paraklesis* ("a renewal and deepening of the apprehension of the *kerygma* in the already converted"), from "instruction" (*didache*) which, he considers, can appropriately be given at evensong, and also from "evangelistic preaching" (*kerygma*) which is addressed to the unconverted. While some of the implications he draws from these distinctions seem rather too schematic and strait-laced, it is altogether salutary that those who are responsible for preaching should be pressed to think out as clearly as possible what are the purpose and point of what they are supposed to be doing in the various contexts in which sermons are called for. It is, however, with the correlation of the ministry of word and sacrament in the holy communion that Professor Fuller is chiefly concerned, and he shows good cause why the precept of the Book of Common Prayer that there should be a sermon at every celebration ought to be carried out, anyhow on Sundays. He adumbrates, on the basis of Scripture and tradition, a profound theology of the relation between the sermon and the rest of the liturgy, illustrating what he says with plentiful reference to the liturgical provisions of the 1661 Prayer Book. It is not necessary to be as satisfied as he appears to be with those provisions in order to derive benefit from his observations and suggestions, though "suggestions" is perhaps too mild a word for the forthright manner in which he lays down the law!

* * * * *

In parishes where in addition to a "parish communion" there is another celebration earlier in the morning, or where the 8 a.m. communion–11 a.m. mattins pattern persists, an equivalent to a liturgical sermon may be supplied by the reading of a "communion paragraph" based on the propers for the day. Many readers of THEOLOGY will already know Dr Austin Farrer's *The Crown of the Year*: a book that is better adapted for such use in parishes is now available in *Paragraphs for Sundays and Holy Days* by D. M. Paton and J. T. Martin (S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d.), and we warmly recommend it. It is said that in many places the number of people is increasing who go to communion at 8 a.m. on Sundays but otherwise seldom attend church, and they are therefore dependent on that service for the ministry of the word as well as of the sacrament. If this tendency continues the reading of communion paragraphs, when there is no

61
758

sermon, is likely to become more and more common, and in any case there is everything to be said for it. They should, of course, be read with due care and solemnity. Though a contemporary provision wrought out of parochial experience, like that by Messrs Paton and Martin, is specially welcome, it is not difficult to select suitable, short passages from the Christian classics, and in the course of time many parish priests may build up their own selection.

* * * * *

A new impression of *The Apostolic Ministry: Essays on the History and the Doctrine of Episcopacy*,[1] which received a good deal of attention in THEOLOGY at the time of its first publication, carries a foreword by Dr Austin Farrer in which he takes note of various criticisms that have been advanced against the volume, allows that certain minor modifications of its argument are or may be needed, but maintains that the argument itself still stands up.

* * * * *

Dr Kitson Clark's book, *The Kingdom of Free Men*,[2] is a worthy sequel to *The English Inheritance*, which we noticed here at some length in August 1950. In the earlier work he made a close survey of our national history and came to the conclusion that the special calling of England is to work out in practice as well as in theory the meaning of freedom. He has now himself made a notable contribution to that task. His starting point is what he calls "The Great Debate". "What is debated is not only what is the best and most efficient form of government, but what ends the State should serve, what form of government will best serve those ends, what rights the State possesses, what obligations rest upon the subjects of the State, and what are the limits of those obligations." What sort of a polity do we stand for in opposition to totalitarianism, and why? If the answer is "liberal democracy", what exactly does that mean, and are there Christian grounds for looking upon it as our right aim and standard? If we stand above all for "liberty", "is the liberty which we demand only for Christians because they are Christians, or do we demand it for men because they are men?" In successive chapters, which are based on a series of lectures delivered for the Divinity Faculty at Cambridge, Dr Kitson Clark brings an abundance of discriminating light to bear on this cluster of vital and far-reaching questions. This is a manual not only for statesmen but for citizens. We are not sure what people mean when they ask for the elucidation of "a Christian ideology", but this is the kind of thing they ought to be taking home to themselves, and then commending to others. See that the book is in your public library.

* * * * *

The latest volume in "The Library of Christian Classics" will make a special appeal to all who are interested in the history of mysticism and in mystical theology as well as in the particular

[1] Hodder and Stoughton, 42s.
[2] Cambridge University Press, 18s. 6d.

authors who are represented in it. It is entitled *Late Medieval Mysticism*[1] and is edited with much enlightening erudition by Dr R. C. Perry, Professor of Church History at Duke University in the U.S.A. Selections from the writings of the following are included, with introductions and annotations: Bernard of Clairvaux, the Victorines, Francis of Assisi, Bonaventure, Ramon Lull, Eckhart, Richard Rolle, Henry Suso, Catherine of Siena, Ruysbroeck, Nicolas of Cusa, and Catherine of Genoa. Altogether, it makes a rich banquet of spiritual nourishment.

* * * * *

Friends of Florence Allshorn and St Julian's Community and also readers of Dr J. H. Oldham's book about her[2] will be glad to have the selection from her papers which has been published under the title *The Notebooks of Florence Allshorn*.[3] It takes the form of short passages, so arranged as to be used for spiritual reading and as a spur to meditation. There was a clean, astringent, realistic quality in her spirituality that speaks to the condition of many souls to-day.

Sect or Church?

NOT all the reviewers of the Rev. Martin Thornton's *Pastoral Theology: A Reorientation* (S.P.C.K., 1956) were as cautious as Archdeacon Forder in THEOLOGY for April 1957; and it is not often that a book is honoured, as this was on the 30th March, by being discussed in the leading article of the *Church Times*; no wonder, then, that it has been widely read by intending clergymen. And that a provocative and challenging thesis should be published and considered; that clergy whose dearest ambition is to "get a good congregation" should be asked to think again; that we should be weaned from our devotion to forms in triplicate with details of confirmed, catechumenate, choral and converted Anglicans, back to the realities of supernatural religion—all this is salutary and splendid. Yet reading Mr Thornton conjures up a nightmarish vision of thousands of Rectors of Woodford[4] battering down the Church of England of the Carolines and Maurice, Lightfoot and Henson, and the liturgical revival, and turning the Establishment into a perfectionist sect.

Mr Thornton rightly says in his preface that his subject is one for a group of writers, "at least a biblical scholar, dogmatist and historian", rather than for one, though it is not said in which of these fields Mr Thornton's own special competence lies. It is certainly true that his book needs to be assessed by biblical and dogmatic theologians and by historians, and the purpose of this article is confined to an examination of the biblical foundation of the argument, which would appear to be an instance of that fanciful exegesis which

[1] S.C.M. Press, 35s.
[2] Reviewed in THEOLOGY, January 1952, pp. 33 f.
[3] S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d.
[4] Cf. J. C. Wansey, in THEOLOGY, August 1954.

336367

without proper historical and historical moorings can become "as dangerous and deceptive as a drifting balloon".[1]

In place of what the author calls "multitudinism" (trying to collect as many people round the parish church as possible), he sets a doctrine of the Remnant: throughout the Bible God works on behalf of the many through a small group of the faithful, who are distinguished by purity in worship and loyalty in faith. A number of Old Testament prophets are cited, while in the gospels the Twelve are chosen by Jesus as a Remnant—"the word Jesus used in speaking of his Body—the Church—is precisely that which in his native tongue means Remnant".[2] ("Precisely"? The Hebrew *shear* (remnant) is translated by St Paul *κατάλεμμα*; the Aramaic original of the *ἐκκλησία* of Matt. 16. 18 and 18. 17 is discussed by Lagrange[3] and by Cullmann,[4] and both prefer to leave the question open. "Indeed, it is not of basic importance," says the latter, "for the important thing is that all of these words belong to the thought world of the people of God." Jesus may have used *kenishta*, which happens to be used in a verbal (Aramaic) form in Dan. 3. 2.[5]) Upon this remnant Jesus lavished most of his time and energy to teach them about himself and to train them in prayer, while from the Jewish multitude he withdrew even his first slender contacts. Beyond the multitude there lies another and a bigger group, the Gentiles, who are altogether outside the ministry of Jesus and of his disciples who are forbidden to go amongst them (Matt. 10. 5).

Now this concept of the Remnant is regarded as the pattern for the Church: God still works on behalf of the many through the faithful few. Thus, in the Middle Ages, after Constantine's edict had secularized the Church "almost to extinction",[6] the Remnant was located in the religious orders. At the present day the Remnant is in the parishes and is composed of the loyal Christians of each place who live disciplined and prayerful lives in union with our Lord through regularly receiving the holy communion and who are guided by the parish priest as the Twelve were instructed by our Lord; so that, after the celebration of the Eucharist, the primary work of a priest is in the direction of souls, not in preaching, evangelizing or administration, and the business of the remnant is not to multiply itself but to worship God on behalf of the whole population. Deliberate missionary work is dubbed recruitment.[7]

Eleven passages in the gospels are used to support this thesis. Thus, on Mark 2. 3–12, we are reminded of the large crowd gathered round the house, to whom "Christ condescended to speak"; it was a nuisance and was in the way of the sick man borne of four, and as soon as he had been lowered through the roof Jesus turns from the

---

[1] E. C. Blackman in *The Background of the N.T. and its Eschatology*, p. 12.
[2] T., p. 34. [3] *Evangile selon Saint Matthieu*, p. 324.
[4] *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*, p. 188.
[5] Cf. E. W. Heaton in *Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1952, p. 27: "To use such phrases as 'the notion of the Remnant' and 'the concept of the Remnant' of oracles where the root (shear) does not occur is to run the risk of serious confusion." [6] T., p. 75. [7] T. pp. 14, etc.

crowd. He absolves the sick of the palsy of his sins and heals him of his disease. Just so, in the life of the Church, a multitude is a nuisance; the need is rather for a small and vigorous remnant, of perhaps only four people, who will lead the occasional soul on the edge of conversion to the living Christ.

The suggestion here is not that the gospels may be expected to yield evidence of the life of the Church, which would shock nobody nowadays, but that the method of the ministry of Jesus, of which the gospels are regarded as giving authentic historical evidence, are the paradigm for the ministry of the Church. And this is surely mistaken, since the triad of Remnant-round-the-Messiah, withdrawn from the multitude, which in turn is withdrawn from the Gentiles, is not an exhaustive account of the New Testament. It is by no means certain that anything as precise as this doctrine of the Remnant can even be elicited from the Old Testament; but supposing one starts from Rom. 9–11, it would seem that the faithful remnant chosen by God was eventually narrowed down to One alone who died for all men and that after his resurrection the process of diminishing was reversed until at the end the whole of creation will be solid in Christ. (Cf. the valuable diagram in Dr Dodd's commentary on the epistle, p. 187.) Therefore, in the gospels the Twelve are not a saving remnant at all. On the contrary, until the crucifixion they were full of misconceptions, and as many as five may actually have cherished Zealot ideals.[1] It is the Lord's resurrection which entirely transforms the situation and then the nucleus rapidly expands. This means that the appropriate paradigm in the New Testament for the Church is not in the gospels, but in the Acts and the epistles, where we see those who have received the apostolic commission at work, hastening to establish communities of Christian believers in all parts of the known world before the coming of the end. No doubt the intensity of life of these communities, whether expressed in miracles or prophecy or moral goodness, provided the observable validation of the missionary preaching and so attracted converts, as Mr Thornton's remnant is expected to do[2] without the labour of preaching or propaganda. But whereas *Pastoral Theology* shares with the Protestant Reformers (Martin Bucer was the one exception) a total lack of interest in missions—the missionary vocation being classed by Thornton along with the vocation to arrange the altar flowers[3]—the evidence of the Acts and the epistles is that evangelizing was a primary work of the Church. Moreover, it is not unreasonable, as the work of the late Dr R. H. Lightfoot and of Dr Farrer has shown, to suppose that the gospels themselves, quite apart from the disputed punctuation of Mark 13. 10, foreshadow a missionary appeal to the Gentiles.[4]

The gospels can also be used to refute the contention that our Lord treated the multitude with contempt. It may be a feature of

[1] So Cullmann in *The State in the New Testament*. (But *three* is more probable.)
[2] T., p. 69.
[3] T., p. 73.
[4] See also J. Munck, *Israel and the Gentiles in the N.T.*, in *J.T.S.*, April, 1951; C. F. Evans in *J.T.S.*, April 1954; and J. Jeremias, *Jesu Verherssung für die Völker* (1956).

the third gospel that Jesus is cold towards the crowd (*ἐπισυναχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου*, Luke 12. 1), which is demon-possessed (Luke 6. 18–19; cf. Acts 5. 16). But Matthew and Mark are much more sympathetic. It is the *ὄχλος* which causes Herod to delay killing the Baptist (Matt. 14. 5); at the entry into Jerusalem the *ὄχλος* is there to welcome Jesus riding in (Matt. 21. 8–11); and it is only as a result of instigation by the Jewish leaders that the *ὄχλος* is provoked into demanding the crucifixion of Jesus, unlike Luke 23. 5. Jesus, moreover, consorted with all manner of people, and (Mark 12. 37) the *πολὺς ὄχλος* heard him gladly. He rebuked the disciples who forbade children to come to him—a passage which has always been brought forward by the defenders of infant baptism—"we employ this passage as a shield against the Anabaptists", wrote Calvin.[1] "It is presumption and sacrilege to drive far from the fold of Christ those whom he cherishes in his bosom, and to shut the door, and exclude as strangers those whom he does not wish to be forbidden to come to him." Mr Thornton probably desires to hedge round baptism with a *multitude* of restrictions; but we cannot be sure, since the sacrament on which the Church is grounded is never discussed—a disquieting omission in a book of nearly three hundred pages purporting to outline the theological foundations of pastoral work! It is presumably unlikely that he would deny that the very large number of baptized and confirmed people are in some sense members of the Church; but he would exclude them from their rightful place round the Lord's table until they have in addition acquired certain notions in their heads. If the slogan is to be "PRIVATE: MEMBERS ONLY",[2] then apparently we may be counted members of the local Christian community not in virtue of our baptism, but only in virtue of certain notions we hold about the obligations of membership. As for the unbaptized, in the gospels God is regarded as Father of all men,[3] and in Matthew the people, who join with the centurion in making the Messianic confession at the foot of the cross, are potential believers in the resurrection. Is it not a tragedy if this potential faith is not brought to fruition by evangelism and instruction? How can the Remnant worship with an easy conscience as long as there are "other sheep"?

Mr Thornton's book does not, like the Jansenists, hold those outside the holy community to be condemned; but the whole spirit of the book is Jansenist and sectarian. It is reminiscent of the (isolated and unrepresentative) saying of Kierkegaard: "Christ only gained eleven men in three and a half years; one apostle got three thousand disciples in an hour." It would turn the Church into an esoteric group with closely guarded secrets, like the community at Qumran. (But the Christian "mystery" is an *open* secret!) The reiterated charge that when Constantine was converted, Christianity became the religion of the Empire, but that was very different from the

[1] *Harmony of Matthew, Mark, Luke.* [2] T., p. 50.
[3] As shown by H. W. Montefiore in *N.T. Studies*, November 1956, and conceded by T., p. 16.

Empire becoming Christian,[1] is in itself true enough,[2] but why does not Thornton share the Church's joy that after 313 she had freedom to propagate the Gospel? Because the fact that thousands in the Empire who otherwise would have lived and died without the saving grace of Christ through the sacraments in the Catholic Church is irrelevant to a thesis which looks on missionary activity as such with suspicion. The extraordinary thing is that *Pastoral Theology* elaborates a rule of penance, counsel and direction which was only developed for the half-converted post-Constantinian Church when large numbers of men, from various motives, were seeking admission into the Church and for whom the rigours of the old system of a single absolution were deemed inappropriate.[3] If "priestly love is consummated not in teaching but in the most intimate relations of ascetical practice—direction and the confessional",[4] then priestly love had remained unconsummated all the centuries until the Irish monks swept away the rule of a single penance![5]

Mr Thornton appears to hold the view that the Remnant-Church is a highly exclusive club in the sense that one is either wholly inside it or wholly outside it[6] (a view on which Fr Victor White has commented: "Certainly the Church is visible, and visible by reason of the visibility of her members and her organization. But the edges are very blurred"[7]), but he admits that the multitude will flock into some of our services.[8] But to them no concessions must be made. Baptized or unbaptized, they ought not to be there, and we must not encourage this indiscriminate church-going:[9] the Offices should remain unintelligible to them—indeed, it will be well if the Remnant itself is "healthily bored"[10] by the discovery of the thick bushes and the dullness of the Moabites and the Hagarenes, since these linguistic puzzles minister to "perfect contemplation". There is only the barest hint that worship should include expository preaching;[11] there is no mention of "the most popular catch-word of contemporary Anglo-Saxon biblical theology",[12] *kerygma*; neither is there any mention of *paraclesis*, "a renewal and deepening of the apprehension of the *kerygma* in the already converted".[13] What about Acts 20, where St Paul at Troas is said to have preached far into the night before breaking bread, a passage which Dr Cullmann[14] invokes in support of the view that the synaxis was from the start inseparable from the Eucharist?

There can be little doubt that the parishes over which Mr Thorn-

---

[1] T., pp. 65, 75.
[2] Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture*, p. 217: "The legacy of Constantinianism was one of confused ideas in which pagan and Christian elements were inextricably mixed."
[3] Mortimer, *The Origins of Private Penance*.
[4] T., p. 47.
[5] Though Gregory of Nazianzus and John Chrysostom both exercised a ministry of direction; see J. T. McNeill, *A History of the Cure of Souls*.
[6] T., p. 144.
[7] *God the Unknown*, p. 174.
[8] T., pp. 21, 166.
[9] T., p. 144.
[10] T., p. 213.
[11] T., p. 220.
[12] *Scottish Journal of Theology*, September 1957.
[13] R. H. Fuller, *What is Liturgical Preaching?* p. 22.
[14] *Early Christian Worship*, p. 29.

ton and Mr Wansey preside exhibit a quality of discipleship which puts to shame this "wicked priest" who advocates a pastoral theology which admittedly requires less courage to operate. Yet their parishes would probably be always in good health whatever was their pastoral technique; and I am concerned lest a host of lesser men use what is in Thornton's case a dynamic philosophy born out of the Church's failure as pious escapism or a high-falutin' excuse for idleness. I am grateful personally for Mr Thornton's stimulating response to his experience in a rural parish. Here is someone honest enough to confess the magnitude of the retreat from Christianity in the countryside, who has worked out a theology which would at least bolster the morale of the clergy and a strategy which, it might be claimed, will at any rate not worsen an already disastrous situation. But reading the review in the *York Quarterly* (February 1957), "If it takes on amongst young priests it may go far to revolutionize the life of the Church of England", the nightmare returns . . . maladroit priests, conscious of the parson's loss of authority, asserting it by refusing the sacraments; rural priests gazing at buttercups instead of visiting the parish;[1] subscriptions to missionary societies cancelled; the Remnants of two or three reciting Evensong in "Greek, Latin, Double Dutch",[2] it does not matter which. And there is the ex-Remnant—he dared to find a service helpful, and was expelled; and another—she got married. "Mon père," if we may adapt St Francis of Sales, "ne vaudrait-il pas mieux ne pas prendre de si grands poissons, et en prendre davantage?"

WILFRID BROWNING.

The Life and Death of Symbols

IT is a fact that the contemporary interest in demythologizing the Bible has arisen almost simultaneously with a revolution in the arts against traditional forms. Bultmann and Picasso have this at least in common, that they are dissatisfied with the vehicles of communication which they have inherited from the past and sceptical of their adequacy to the task of communication in the modern world. Since the arts are no less concerned than theology with the communication of ideas by means of symbols, it is unlikely that these similar protests against existing forms in theology and the arts should have arisen coincidentally for entirely unrelated reasons. On the contrary, they are much more likely to be connected in view of the close relationship which has always existed between theology and the arts. Not only were the prophets poets, but during the greater part of the history of mankind the plastic arts have been almost exclusively devoted to the visual communication and vivid realization of religious concepts. It is only since the Renaissance in Europe that a predominantly secular school of painting and sculpture has developed, for the divorce between theology and the arts is a local and

[1] T., p. 176. [2] T., p. 217.

recent phenomenon; by nature they belong together, and any development in one field may reasonably be expected to throw light upon a similar development in the other.

This is not only theoretically probable; it is historically demonstrable. In fact, the *weltanschauung* of any particular age, godly or godless, has been reflected in its works of art, simply because it is the purpose of works of art to realize, embody, and express the leading ideas of the age in which they are produced. These leading ideas are the "truths" which artists have been concerned, albeit unconsciously, to communicate to their contemporaries and, if their works have been durable, to posterity. This applies equally well to a negro carving of a dead ancestor, which conveys to the spectator something of the terror and the power of the dead, as to a *fête champêtre* by Watteau reflecting, as it does, something of the elegant frivolity and the pseudo-pastoral escapism of the French court in the early eighteenth century. But such leading ideas are not always static, and as they change or develop, so contemporary works of art, if they are to reflect the changes, must change too. Thus the virtue of originality in an artist is that it is a measure of his sensitivity to the developing ethos of his time and a gauge of his ability to reflect it. This is well exemplified by the development of specifically Christian art which faithfully reflects the changes which have occurred in the theological climate down the ages. It is only necessary to compare, for example, a Byzantine Christ with a Christ by Rubens to see that, while the former is a graphic symbol of the incarnate *logos*, the latter is more concerned with Christ's humanity which so engrossed a humanist age. Thus the primary relationship between artistic and theological communication is one of purpose.

But it is also one of terms. It is a commonplace to-day to say that the purpose of a myth is to express a religious truth in terms which need not be literally true or historically possible. But precisely the same kind of thing can be said of a work of art. Its purpose is to convey a truth which, whatever it may be, is expressed in, and communicated to others by, the subject of the work in question; but it is always more than the mere subject, which is strictly irrelevant to the work's underlying truth except as its necessary vehicle. For example, a portrait of an old man by Rembrandt is a work of art just precisely in so far as it is more than an exact reproduction of an old man, feature by feature, wrinkle by wrinkle. The subject evokes in the spectator an apprehension of the truth which it was Rembrandt's purpose to convey; it does not contain it. More obviously, the worth of a Madonna and Child by, for instance, Cimabue does not depend upon the historical existence or the physical possibility of a woman and child exactly resembling the painted figures. Cimabue's dome-headed, erect, long-fingered figures of the Christ child never existed historically and are anatomically impossible, but this impugns neither the quality of his work nor its truth. As with a Byzantine Christ, a Christ child by Cimabue is a graphic symbol of the incarnation of the word of God, and is not concerned with the physical appearance of a human baby. So myths and works of art

alike are attempts to express various truths in terms which need not be real or historical.

To carry the comparison a step further, the advocates of demythologizing say that, since many of the terms of the biblical myths belong to cosmologies which are no longer acceptable, they should be discarded; and it is here that the closest similarity exists between the contemporary situations in theology and the arts, for the advocates of "modern" art contend, too, that traditional methods and symbols are no longer usable to-day. The question, then, arises as to why the conventional artistic symbols and terms—the style, in fact—which proved adequate to the changing and developing needs of five centuries should suddenly have died. For a long time after the Renaissance, the originality of painters and sculptors was able to find expression within the limits of what may be described as representational symbolism or naturalism. Now, however, this post-Renaissance European naturalism and its traditional type of symbolism is dead. Why?

In the arts a style lives for just so long as its symbols continue to be used as symbols pointing to something beyond themselves. Once a symbol is used for its own sake and is treated as a fact—that is to say, as a self-sufficient reality—it dies. In this lies the difference between an original work and *pastiche*, for *pastiche* is the result of a slavish copying by one man of another man's symbols for their own sake without understanding them or what they point to; in other words, *pastiche* is a copy of another man's style for itself. For example, most of the carved angels on riddel posts in churches are entirely lifeless and meaningless. They have been produced by men with their eyes fixed, not on any reality in which they have believed, but on works of the past. At the other extreme, a Byzantine angel (or one by Fra Angelico or El Greco) is a living symbol of something in the underlying reality of which the artist believed, and to which his work points. Therefore it is obvious that a school of art will only continue to live so long as its symbols can symbolize, and that it will die when they can no longer point to a reality beyond themselves; and this must occur as soon as they are set up as realities in themselves.

Theoretically, therefore, the life of a style will probably be short, when its symbols are such as may easily be mistaken for realities, and long when their symbolic nature is difficult to overlook. This is borne out by history, for the symbols used in formalized, conventional, and near-abstract art have been far longer lived than those used in naturalism. For example, it would be difficult to mistake the symbolic nature of a Byzantine angel or a portrait sculpture of Ramses II, since they are so far removed from natural appearances as to make their identification with reality improbable; and the Byzantine and Egyptian schools remained vigorous for centuries with only very little change in the vital symbols which they used. On the other hand, the naturalist heyday of the golden age in Greece was short lived, and the history of European naturalism has been the history of constant changes and modifications of style. So the human-

ism of the Renaissance introduced a process into European art which necessarily led to the eventual death of the symbols which it adopted or created, for humanism by its nature rivets the attention to man and his environment, which is the same thing in the plastic arts as riveting it to natural appearances. So the symbols used became more and more easily mistakable for the reality, until they began to be regarded as ends in themselves which were in no need of an underlying significance. Indeed, the artist's purpose became precisely that of presenting the symbols as realities, and in the nineteenth century this process reached its culmination in the works of the Pre-Raphaelites and the Impressionists who, in their different ways, were dedicated to unqualified verisimilitude for its own sake.

But it was not only in the arts that the Renaissance initiated a progressive infiltration of humanism, for the arts merely reflected what was going on throughout the developing ethos of Christendom. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the seeds of the idea that man was valuable in himself, apart from his status as a member of the redeemed community of Christ's Church, began to sprout. At the same time, greater attention began to be paid by such theologians as St Bernard of Clairvaux to the humanity of Christ, and the Sienese and Florentine painters faithfully reflected the nascent *weltanschauung* of humanism by naturalizing and humanizing their pictorial symbols. The logical conclusion of the process thus introduced was reached in Harnack's liberal humanism, on the one hand, which denied any possible underlying reality to the material symbols on *a priori* grounds, and in modern fundamentalism, on the other hand, which equated the material symbols with reality, thus obscuring the truth to which they should have pointed, killing the symbols as symbols, and idolatrously enthroning them as realities in themselves.

As in the arts therefore, so in theology humanism eventually kills traditional symbols. Biblically, the greatest peril of such a succession of events is that it leads to a situation in which it is more than a little doubtful whether it is possible to recognize or believe in the real truth underlying the symbols, while they themselves are regarded as "true". So, for example, it becomes necessary to ask if it is possible to recognize the truth of Matthew's story of the Epiphany while believing that three actual men on camels followed a star or a conjunction of stars on an historical journey, or if a subscription to the literal historicity of this story does not preclude recognition of the truth which it was Matthew's purpose to communicate to his readers.

However, it may be objected that, if the results of demythologizing are going to be similar in the theological field to the unintelligible chaos of modern art, they should be avoided at all costs. But the results need not be similar, for the theologians are not faced with the same problem as that which confronts the artists. The latter are faced with the problem of either creating a new set of symbols or adapting borrowed symbols to their purpose of reflecting and embodying in their work the leading ideas of the contemporary ethos.

So far their attempts to do this have involved them in a syncretistic maelstrom of freely modified styles which have been borrowed from such widely separated sources as Japanese coloured prints, negro carvings, and the bronze age sculpture of pre-Hellenic Greece. The apparently rootless and bewildering confusion of modern art is, however, a most faithful reflection of the ethos of the twentieth century, which is precisely a rootless and bewildering confusion of thought in which such new leading ideas as those of dialectical materialism rub shoulders with the religious syncretism of the Isherwood-Heard-Huxley sect, the revived astrology of "What the Stars Foretell", and the unimaginative materialism which is the end-product of fundamentalist humanism.

Unlike that of the artists, the task of the theologians is not to reflect this contemporary chaos but to inject into it the abiding truths of the great biblical myths with or without the symbols by means of which they have been imparted to mankind in the past. It is sometimes argued that it is impossible to recognize or believe in a truth in the absence of its symbol. But if this were the case, it would be equivalent to saying that men had first invented the symbols for no apparent reason, and had later made the remarkable discovery that, by chance, they happened to mean something. This is to put the cart before the horse with a vengeance. On the contrary, experience of the reality must always precede the invention of a symbol for its conveyance. But if the invented symbols are no longer able to draw men's attention to that reality, simply because they are believed to be realities in themselves, they are useless as evangelistic tools, and men's attention must be drawn to the reality in some other way.

It is evident that there can be only two ways of doing this: either new symbols must be created (remythologization), or people must again be taught to distinguish between the symbol and the reality. If the arts are a reliable guide, the prospects of a quick success with remythologization are remote in the extreme. The whole history of art is witness to the extreme difficulty of creating new symbols and to the slowness with which men gradually learn to accept and understand them. The hostility and antipathy aroused by many of Picasso's brilliantly apt and original graphic symbols of contemporary disintegration provide a modern example. On the other hand, the task of re-educating people to understand the old existing symbols should be less difficult than that of creating new ones to replace them; for there are historical precedents for the possibility of such a re-education. For instance, it was not long ago that painters of the stature of Piero della Francesca were classed as "primitives", and looked upon as unfortunate in having lived at a time when it was impossible to produce work of much abiding worth or significance. Such a judgment was the result of looking for a developed humanist symbolism where it could not exist, and represented a failure to understand the symbolism which did exist. But to-day Piero and his contemporaries are appreciated at their true worth, for their style is seen to be, not an ineffective fumbling after the style of Leonardo, but at least as

significant and eloquent as the style of any other age. In other words, people have learnt to understand again the symbolism of the primitives.

But if this is encouraging as an example of the way in which the true significance of a set of symbols may be rediscovered, it must be added that the rediscovery has been made by only a few people. A visit to the galleries containing the primitives is still regarded by most people as the somewhat tedious duty of paying ritual homage to works which are "out of drawing" and unintelligible. In fact, one of the most discouraging aspects of the contemporary situation is the modern insensitivity to all kinds of symbolic communication. The humanist ideal of equating symbols with realities, as represented by the worship of verisimilitude in the arts and by fundamentalism in theology, together with the closely related liberal ideal (also humanist in ancestry) of popular science, which equates the real with the material, captures and conditions the minds of people as they grow up, until eventually they are altogether unable to understand the value or purpose of symbols. The average child fills his drawing book with graphic symbols, but by the time that he has developed into the average adult, he is a logical positivist at heart. So unless and until people are no longer subjected to this conditioning process, any theological re-education in the meaning of the biblical myths will be confined to a small minority.

However, it is just when this familiar and depressing conclusion is reached that modern art unexpectedly provides a welcome ground for optimism. In the past, the arts have often acted prophetically, foreshadowing changes in their parent ethos before such changes have spread throughout society, rather as a barometer gives notice of a change in the weather long before storm-clouds appear over the horizon. As already mentioned, indications of the coming humanism of the high Renaissance were given by artists as early as the twelfth century, while the ethos of the day was still far from humanist, and they were amply justified by events. Indeed, such prophetic indications of the shape of things to come have usually proved reliable, and there is no reason to distrust an indication which exists to-day that a widespread reaction against materialist humanism is on the way. For while it is true that modern art reflects the confusion and the fear of our society, it is, in itself, an explosive protest against the limitations of materialism. As a movement it may be bewildering and diverse in its manifestations, but one thing is common to them all: namely, a return to symbolic means of communication; that is to say, a violent re-affirmation of the value and validity of symbolism over against verisimilitude. Even the popularity of "child art" is a straw in the same propitious wind. From their own materialist point of view the Communists are right to distrust modern art and to encourage "socialist realism" in its stead, for its re-affirmation of a kind of truth which can only be imparted by means of symbols is as great a menace to Marxist philosophy as it is a potential support to theology.

In conclusion, it may fairly be claimed that theologians may learn

something from a study, however cursory, of the nature and history of the symbols used by artists. In both fields it is a disastrous mistake to conclude that the symbol (or myth) *is* the reality symbolized, and the more vehemently it is insisted that the symbols are true in themselves the more certainly will they obscure or falsify the truth which they should convey. If demythologization is defined, not necessarily as the discarding of symbols from ancient cosmologies, but as a process of clearly distinguishing between symbols—ancient or modern—and the truth symbolized, it is an inescapably necessary process in an age which follows the final murder of traditional symbols in the nineteenth century: a murder committed by humanism. Remythologization, however, would almost certainly be a long, gradual, and bitterly contested process, and it might even prove impossible; but there are good grounds for believing that men are longing to be freed from the intellectual and spiritual limitations imposed upon them by the narrow dogmatic assumptions of humanist materialism, and that a return to symbolic and analogical ways of thought and communication is not as improbable a contingency as it may superficially appear to be. Timid conservatism, fear of talking "over the heads" of the laity, and specious pleas of evangelistic expediency, all of which may tend to persuade clergymen to "play safe" and preach myth as history and symbol as reality, are the devil's advocates and will lead to a dead and self-stultifying academism. In theology as in the arts, this is not to play safe, but to commit suicide. Instead, what is needed is radical honesty in preaching and teaching, faith in the intelligence and sensitivity of the laity, and the apparently inexpedient courage to affirm that any true evangelism must be rooted in the works of the Evangelists, who often interpret the reality of history in terms of myth and symbol, because the fulness of that reality cannot be described merely in terms of local episode and material event.

ANTONY BRIDGE.

American Letter

MEDICINE AND THE CHURCHES

THAT the hospices of Aesculapius were both temples and hospitals has not been entirely forgotten by the medical profession in America. Most often, however, this has been thought a fact best left to the dim and distant past. Although this attitude is changing, when the Hippocratic oath is administered (as it seldom is now), the names of the old gods are usually omitted, nor is a Christian name substituted. No doubt the gods actually in mind are Science and Human Welfare, but it is deemed unnecessary to name them openly.

Nor is this silence surprising in the face of the confusing variety of interpretation that Christians in America, as elsewhere, have placed on their deep conviction that "of the Most High cometh healing". Nevertheless, in this century developments in three areas may clarify some of the basic issues, as well as allow for a fuller measure of practical co-operation between medicine and the ministry. These three

are the debated matter of spiritual healing, the greater provision for hospital chaplaincies, and the appearance of a new pastoral counselling.

Spiritual healing presents the most vexing problem of the three, for it seems too close to Christian Science. Of course, Christian Science, a native if not typical product of American life, has met regular and sometimes concerted opposition from Christianity and medical science. Like other heresies, however, it has also made many a Christian conscience twinge at the apparent neglect by the churches of Christ's commission "to heal the sick". Not only in esoteric cults but also in the established religious communions, there are many healing services conducted by the regular ministers, as well as by those with charismatic gifts, services of intercession, meditation, the laying-on-of-hands and the public use of Unction. Episcopalians seem to be especially active and interested. These efforts often remedy the neglect by a spiritual healing which seems opposed to medical science in fact, if not in theory. Many fringe cults do oppose medicine for "biblical" reasons; but even Agnes Sanford, an Anglican healer, in speaking of doctors in *The Healing Light*, while saying that physicians help both body and mind, illustrates this by stories with the plain implication that prayer succeeds where medicine fails. In many such books the air of naïve self-righteousness, or of possession of esoteric knowledge, puts people off, especially because serious rational and scientific questions are glossed over. Not least among them is the grave theological question of the optimism of what one might call "a realizable eschatology", that Pelagian view of Genesis 1 and 2 in which if everyone "lived constantly in harmony with him, there would be no pain" (op. cit., p. 81). This view which names no value at all to sufferings seems to have infected the writers of the proposed *Order for the Ministration to the Sick* (*Prayer Book Studies* III, 1951) who include a section on repentance but none on acceptance of finitude, and nothing on suffering with Christ's sufferings, nor on being glorified together with him; instead, there is only optimistic petition about getting well. This certainly is the other extreme from Extreme Unction.

On the other hand, some serious attention is being given to the question of evidence that faith in fact does heal, and to the manner of gathering such evidence. The biggest problem here seems to be that healers temperamentally cannot work in the austere atmosphere which medical research requires. Other serious questions about the place of psychological factors in all healing, about the relation of parapsychology to psychology and to scientific theory in general, and about the relation of medical sciences to the medical arts, all these receive attention. A committee of the National Council of Churches is at work on such matters, and several independent conferences at Wainwright House have discussed them. The basic problem seems to be, not whether healing comes of the Most High, but whether it comes "spiritually". If so, is that spirituality to be seen ecclesiastically, sacramentally, charismatically, medically, psychologically, or in some combination or combinations of these modes?

Another area of development, which receives more attention, is the increased co-operation of physicians and ministers, especially chaplains. This comes about in two ways, as a meeting of minds, and as practical team-work. A problem, greater than Christian Science, is the narrowly scientific education of medical students. The narrowness has become apparent in the great success of fundamentalist movements in medical schools, such as "Youth for Christ", which seem to move into the vacuum left by excluding the study of history and of the liberal arts from any place, even preparatory place, in the medical curriculum. To meet this problem a few centres have been established near medical schools and hospitals, notably the Bishop Anderson House in Chicago, with programs patterned after the chaplaincies and Canterbury Clubs in colleges. Lectures and discussion groups are provided for faculty members, as well as for students. In other places conferences have been arranged for medical and theological students together. These intellectual encounters enable medical people to see, many for the first time, a Christianity not concerned for faith apart from reason and science, nor concerned merely to place moral limits on possible medical procedures, like much Roman Catholic talk of natural law. It might be remarked that there are a few signs of a Roman Catholic interest which goes beyond the customary one in pastoral physiology to Christian vocations in medicine and to the psychological component in pastoral work. And it must be remarked that there are signs of fresh interest in what Christian ethics, apart from Thomistic theory, can have to say about medical matters, e.g. the public lectures by Joseph F. Fletcher and the lectures by Willard L. Sperry delivered at the Massachusetts General Hospital and the medical school of the University of Michigan.

These chaplaincies in medical schools are in addition to the many new chaplaincies for the pastoral care of patients that have been established in government-supported and private hospitals. Many denominations, often through local Councils of Churches, now extend work that Episcopalians and Lutherans have long been doing. Chaplaincies since the war are often established on a principle like that of the armed services, that no one if possible should be deprived of the opportunity for religious ministrations which would be his at home. But beyond this, the medical staff in many places welcomes a trained chaplain as part of "the therapeutic team". About the pastoral work, the book by Dr Richard Cabot and Russell Dicks still stands foremost here; about the team-work, the admirable symposium edited by Paul Maves, *The Church and Mental Health*, sees its outreach from hospital experience into the parish and general community. Meanwhile Church hospitals largely continue as accepted works of mercy, but some of them disappear for financial reasons or lose their identity in mergers to form large medical centres. There seems to be little rationale offered for their existence under religious auspices. On the whole they seem on the one hand to keep the religious language of their charters and on the other to be governed by principles of Science and Welfare, not letting the one hand know what the other

doeth. In a few places, however, medicine, and especially nursing, are held up as Christian vocations and ministries, that those who serve the Most High will know his Name.

The attention to spiritual and emotional factors in healing and the attention to the psychological substratum in all health and illness, of common concern to all who work with the sick, have made for the greatest measure of interest in matters where psychiatry and pastoral work meet. At any conference of medical men and ministers, it is the psychiatrists who are interested, as has appeared to be the case in the University Seminar at Columbia University, and in the forums at the Washington and at the New York cathedrals. Also, this can be seen in the list of those attending the conferences of the New York Academy of Medicine, the transactions of which have been published under the title, *Ministry and Medicine in Human Relations*. Their interest has been reflected for thirty years in the work of the Council for Clinical Training which places theological students for supervised training under chaplains in hospitals and prisons, work which is now required at the Theological Seminary in Virginia. Again, it is to be seen in the new programs of psychiatry and religion at Harvard and at Union Theological Seminary, both of which are under joint leadership of a psychiatrist and a clergyman.

The relation of psychiatry to religion is a live issue, in America as elsewhere and now as formerly, with many partisans on many sides. Here the "Christian Freudianism" of the later work of Elwood Worchester at the beginning of the century made it clear that some gifted pastors could do therapeutic work that was both theologically grounded and psychologically informed. To guard against the gifted acting as half-baked psychiatrists, and to arrange for a suitable course of training, have required continued contact with psychiatrists. If for a time it seemed that theological students were only learning what psychiatry had to say about human nature, now it is apparent that the psychiatrists have also learned something. That, along with the present renewed concern in religious circles for theology itself, seems to be working towards definition of a pastoral psychology. Although no doubt this is still better in practice than in theory, hopefully that situation will be changed by the concentrated attention now being given in theological schools to the problem. That such pastoral psychology will not be out of touch with medicine as a whole is the more likely now that psychiatry and psychoanalytic thought are coming to be a regular part of the studies of leading American medical schools. The age of anxiety seems to call for many therapies, and in many ways now therapy looks to the Most High.

THOMAS J. BIGHAM.

A Letter from Pusey to Bishop Maltby

THIS letter has turned up in the mountainous Grey of Howick collection recently deposited in the Prior's Kitchen, The College,

Durham.[1] It was written in Oxford just a few weeks before Keble's Assize Sermon, and addressed to Edward Maltby, Bishop of Chichester, with whom Pusey had remained on good terms ever since he had studied the classics under Maltby's roof and guidance in 1817–18. The Grey papers contain no other letters either from or to Pusey, but there are sixteen from Maltby to the 2nd Earl Grey, to whom he was indebted for his mitre:[2] and it is reasonable to suppose that the young man in question (who is not mentioned in any of the surrounding correspondence) was a Grey or at least someone in whose future the Whig premier was interested. Two of Grey's sons are possible candidates. His fifth son John went up to Trinity in 1829, took a First in Classics in 1832, and was ordained deacon three years later. Francis Richard, a year younger, went up to Trinity in 1831, graduated in 1834, and took orders in 1836. But they are unlikely candidates. Maltby's inquiries would appear to be as late for John as they would be early for Francis. The probabilities are that Grey, having some young relative or protégé in view, had asked Maltby about the value of a sojourn in Germany, and that Maltby, whose reputation rested solely on the twin columns of classics and Whiggery, had handed the question on to a friend and fellow-liberal who stood before the learned world very prominently at this time as an authority on contemporary German theology and theological education.[3]

But the identity of this fortunate young man, whose deliberate progress towards ordination so powerfully suggests a family living in the offing, and of Pusey's "young friend Henry", are questions of very meagre interest compared with the great unanswered question of Pusey's life on which this letter has some bearing. It was written in the middle of what to the modern historian must seem the most interesting period of Pusey's life, the period in which he was undergoing a complete change of character. About 1830 he was known as a moderate liberal: by the later 'forties he was fixed in his better-known character as the Tractarian leader who carried the banner back to Oxford from Oscott and held it so bravely high that the Tractarians were, in fact, best known as Puseyites through the middle decades of the century. This change was a profound one for Pusey and it has proved a singularly important one for the Church of England, but neither its causation nor its consequences have yet been seriously studied.

---

[1] I must express my gratitude to Dr Conway Davies for the readiness with which he made this great collection available, and to Mr Malcolm Jack, who permitted me to draw freely on his thorough knowledge of it.

[2] Lord Holland seems to have had something to do with it too. When Grey formed his administration, Holland declined an active office, but said "an occasional voice in Church Patronage would tickle my fancy" (letter of 18 November 1830): Maltby topped a list of candidates for bishoprics which he sent to Grey on 14 July 1831.

[3] The first part of Pusey's *Historical Inquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany* appeared in May 1828; the second and longer part in May 1830. See Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, i, 152, 170.

The reason appears to be the very promptness and excellence of Pusey's first biographer. It is a natural law that the better the contemporary biography of a great Victorian, the longer must he wait for a proper re-appraisal in this century: and Liddon's *Life of Pusey* is very good indeed. It is voluminous, comprehensive, crammed with copious quotations, and illuminating as only a biography by a direct disciple can be. But it has its defects. A disciple is not likely to show more interest in his master's life than his master showed, nor will he see merit where his master saw none. Since Pusey himself came to regret and renounce his early liberal views and to insist that no part of them was compatible with Anglo-Catholic truth as he defined it, Liddon did little more than record the facts, blur the edges of Pusey's early liberalism, and emphasize his total recovery from it.[1] He was not in the least attracted by the lights which his hero had first followed, not in the least interested in the possibility of their having contained at least some elements of value. The affair was, moreover, rather embarrassing, in that the opponent who showed Pusey up as a man of intelligent liberalism and charity was that founding father of the Oxford Movement, the Cambridge and Hackney divine H. J. Rose. No wonder that Rose's biographer, Dean Burgon, thought it "needless to add another word" to his brief account of the controversy, which had—he was writing in 1888!—"long since lost all its interest".[2] The view of the affair generally taken by ardent admirers of the Oxford Movement is perhaps well suggested by a previous owner of my copy of Liddon's *Pusey*, among whose pencilled annotations appears, against this awkward chapter 8, the warning "May be missed".

But this will no longer do. As every theological student now knows, there was much more in the Germans than Pusey allowed himself to believe. The publication of *Lux Mundi*, only seven years after Pusey's death, announced that even in the Oxford camp this was being recognized, as it had of course been already recognized in some of the camps which Oxford had been denouncing for the previous half-century. Pusey's failure to regroup his forces on this sector of the front meant that he became, in effect, an obstacle to the reformulation of the Anglican apologetic in those terms which alone could make it credible to the educated modern mind.[3] It is accord-

[1] It may be added that he recorded the distasteful facts of Pusey's controversy with Rose with a large fairness and accuracy by no means the rule among nineteenth-century clerical biographers.

[2] J. W. Burgon, *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, ch. 2 (new edn., 1891, p. 72). There appears to be nothing else on Rose except a slight article by A. M. Ramsey in the *Durham University Journal* (December 1941), N.S. iii, 50–8.

[3] Pusey's failure to keep in sight of the German lights has been lamented by writers as different in period and character as J. Tulloch (*Movements of Religious Thought in Britain in the Nineteenth Century*, New York, 1885, p. 91); V. F. Storr (*The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, London, 1913, pp. 188–9); J. K. Mozley (*Some Tendencies in British Theology*, London, 1951, Introduction, especially pp. 12–13); and Henry Chadwick ('Der Einfluss der deutschen protestantischen Theologie auf die Englische Kirche im 19 Jahrhundert', in *Evangelische Theologie*, December 1956, p. 561).

ingly high time that his life and opinions were re-examined, not only because he stood so high among the great Victorians and led their greatest religious movement, but equally because he was the one man whose education and early life qualified him to lead that movement in the direction which would have made its great influence even greater. And just why he was unable to do this is, frankly, a mystery.

When another Liddon arises to undertake this formidable task, he may find this letter helpful. It is reprinted here exactly as it stands, except that the writer's habitual abbreviations for the words "would, could, that and the" have been extended.

G. F. A. Best.

Christ Church.
18 *June* [1833].

My dear Lord,

I need not say that it will always give me much real pleasure at any time to render any service, which I may be able, in any case in which you are interested. With regard to the point, upon which you now consult me, notwithstanding the love which I have for many of the principal German theologians, I cannot but feel that the state of opinion there is still too unsettled to make it a desirable school for a young theologian at the outset of his studies. There are indeed men among the divines of Germany of whom one cannot think but with reverence; but it is a very troubled sea; and it would be very desirable for a person to have acquired fixed and well defined ideas and principles, before he plunges into it: at the end of a course of theological education, this comparison of the divines of his own country and church with those of others, will often be useful, and will often make his views and his feelings more Catholic, while it extends and corrects them: at the beginning, it would probably only retard the time when he would acquire any settled views of his own at all: and the more promise there is of a rich future harvest, the more care it generally requires: as the minds of the greatest compass are generally the latest matured. On other accounts also, a theologian would travel with much more profit somewhat later: for any person of inquiring mind will find the best German theologians exceedingly communicative, but here, as every where else, it requires some proficiency, to enable a person to inquire to any good purpose. Another consideration with regard to the visit to Germany would be, as to the mode in which the individual in question proposes to devote his powers to the Church, i.e. whether principally as a Divine, or (if the distinction must be made) as a practical theologian. For it is in the former case, that a residence in Germany would be of most use to him, as it would be most necessary to call in all the aids which he can command, and survey his subject on every side: as a practical theologian it would comparatively be of much less service.

If a residence in Germany sooner or later be determined on, I should think both Berlin and Bonn much preferable to Göttingen, and a residence in Germany would best be divided between them. Theological instruction in Germany is so much more subdivided

than among us, that one University can never have a very decided preference over *all* the rest; and the plan which is generally pursued by the students, would be followed by a stranger without its disadvantages, of staying at each University long enough to attend the best lectures there. Thus at Berlin is by far the best ecclesiastical historian (Neander) and a very good Hebrew Professor and Commentator (Hengstenberg) the best expositors of the N.T. are Tholuck at Halle and Lücke at Göttingen; Doctrinal theology is best taught by Twesten of Kiel and Nitzsch at Bonn. To any of these (except Twesten) I could gladly give a letter in introduction to any friend of your's, and as soon as a person became well acquainted with any one of them, he could easily be provided with introductions to any other he might wish to know in Germany.

With regard to a well-informed Clergyman in England with whom he might for a time reside, many such might, I doubt not, be found and I could probably myself find one: but in order to know, whom to recommend or to apply to, one ought to know something of the character of the young man himself e.g. if he had a quick perception of the ludicrous, he would probably undervalue an able man who was defective in taste etc. etc. If you could furnish me with a general notice of the individual I would do my best in this respect also.

One plan you seem to think wholly out of the case, a continued residence at his own University. We have not indeed the same advantages for professional instruction, which their admirable division of labor [*sic*] gives them in Germany, and the theological Professor in general is required to teach a variety of subjects, which it is impossible that any mind can adequately grasp, or be equally adapted for. In Germany, every University has 5 theological Professors, each of whom has his distinct office; here the only attempt at subdivision has been that the Old Testament has been assigned to my office. Still however, when there was so much leisure left, before the individual proposed to take orders, I should certainly recommend any individual in my own University, who could afford it, to continue for a time to reside, in order to attend the private lectures of the Divinity Professor and to become acquainted with the language of the O.T.

I had nearly forgotten to answer two of your questions. My object in my 1st visit to G. was to become acquainted with the language and theology more thoroughly and more expeditiously than I could in England: that of my 2nd visit, was to extend my knowledge of their theology, at the same time that I devoted myself to the study of the dialects most useful for the understanding of Hebrew. I lived in the simplest style, without a servant of my own, the cheapness of things varies much, but living is cheap everywhere: at Bonn my whole expenses did not exceed £1 a week. Berlin might perhaps be double.

I am sorry that I could not send this letter yesterday, an ordination at which I was present having occupied great [*sic*] part of the day. Mrs Pusey and myself are very much obliged to you for your kind invitation to Chichester, but my occupations at present keep me at Oxford or Pusey when I can move with all my books. I need not say

that I shall be very happy to see my young friend Henry, altho' I have not so much time, as I could wish, having to examine for two Hebrew Scholarships, besides my lectures.

With best remembrances to Mrs Maltby I remain, Yours truly and obliged, E. B. PUSEY.

Post-marked and franked 18 and 19 June 1833.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Wilfrid Browning is Rector of Great Haseley and a Lecturer at Cuddesdon Theological College.

The Rev. Antony Bridge is Assistant Curate at Hythe parish church. Before ordination he was for many years a professional painter.

The Rev. T. J. Bigham is on the staff of the General Theological Seminary, New York City.

Dr Best is a Fellow of Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

CORRESPONDENCE

OFFERTORY AND OBLATION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

After reading Dr Mascall's letter in your October number I think that the only difference between us is that he is more daring than I am in compressing meaning into a single sentence. Nothing that we can say will ever exhaust the mystery of the eucharist. The Rev. H. B. Porter, in his interesting letter, does not refer to the passage in Jungmann's *Missarum Sollemnia* (vol. i, pp. 480–90, especially p. 485), which I had cited in justification of taking the prayers of the prone, and therefore our own prayers after the Gospel and sermon, as "a special evolution of the old prayer of the faithful". I still think this summary a good deal more weighty than the accounts given in *The Shape of the Liturgy*. To interpret the prayer for the church militant as a prayer for offerers may be edifying, but those who have studied Bishop John Dowden's exegesis of "alms and oblations", either in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April 1900, or in *Further Studies in the Prayer Book* (1908), will not ascribe this interpretation to the revisers of 1662. This may not matter. At any rate the prayer in its present position is part of the antecommunion, and in that context we must look for its meaning.

Yours faithfully,
GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

KELHAM, NEWARK, NOTTS.

BISHOP BUTLER AND THE PRIMACY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In THEOLOGY for September 1936 (Vol. XXXIII, No. 195) I argued that Bishop Joseph Butler was not offered the archbishopric of Canterbury on the death of Archbishop Potter in 1747. Potter died on 10 October, and the primacy was declined by Bishop Gibson of London on 12 October. From the letter of Gibson refusing the honour to the appointment of Archbishop Herring of York, all the stages in the negotiation were established by extant correspondence. The missing link was the possibility of an offer to Butler on 11 October 1747.

This link is now supplied by a letter from William Gibson, son of the Bishop of London, which Dr Thomas Loveday, formerly Vice-Chancellor of Bristol University, has discovered amongst his family papers. The letter is dated 13 October 1747, written from Windsor, and reads: "Dear Brother, I trouble you with this account, which I have just received from Whitehall, in regard to the Archbishoprick of Canterbury, to furnish you with an answer to any questions that may be asked you on that head as far as the Bishop of London is concerned. The Archbishop died on Saturday; and on Monday His Majesty was pleased to send the Duke of Newcastle to Whitehall to let my father know that he would not suffer anything to be said to him concerning that promotion, till he knew what his resolution was; which gracious offer the Bishop answered with a dutiful excuse. Upon his refusal, it is imagined that the Bishop of Salisbury will have it, and that Llandaff will come to Salisbury."

It is now certain, therefore, that Butler was not offered the primacy in 1747; and consequently the legend of his refusal on the ground that "it was too late to support a falling Church", is one of the picturesque fables which have gathered round his name and the Church of his times.

NORMAN SYKES.

EMMANUEL COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.
14 *November* 1957.

INTINCTION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Dr Shepherd's valuable summary of the use of intinction in the American Church, showing clearly, as he says, that intinction is in the Episcopal Church to stay and that in eight dioceses it is resorted to in no less than 50 per cent of the parishes, should prove of considerable service to all who have the future strength of the Church of England at heart. Especially to be noted are his statements that Americans in their public schooling, as our own pupils, "are conditioned very definitely to view any drinking from common cups as insanitary and unsafe" and that "there is no doubt that

hygienic reasons motivate most of those who favour intinction", although "many . . . object to a common cup for aesthetic reasons of taste".

Sooner or later a departure from the present method of administering the Chalice in the Church of England is inevitable. Over many years I have collected considerable evidence coming to me as an ordinary priest of the harmful influence of the present custom. This evidence leads to the conclusion that rather than do something contrary to their elementary rules of hygiene and aesthetic discrimination not a few absent themselves from the Sacrament altogether. Should any need evidence of the mental approach of a considerable number to receiving from the Chalice they should count how many among the communicants they have known turn the Cup in their hands before they receive. My own conclusion is that there is scarcely a congregation of fifteen or so communicants in any church in the land where at least one will not be found to do this always. At present I have more than a dozen. What are they seeking to avoid? Under medical advice given a few months ago one communicant here receives last of all by intinction. A server, a grammar school boy just gone to the university, seeing this for the first time, asked what I had done. He eagerly remarked, "Many would like to receive that way. I should." When the Church of England is really truthful towards the knowledge which in these days is so abundantly being given to us and whose integration with the life and teaching of the Church was apparently so much the concern of the Bishop of Chichester in his recent very favourably received Convocation resolution, she will be impelled to adopt a change of method in administering the Chalice.

The only alternative method that would prove generally acceptable and is entirely satisfactory is intinction. At the moment this whole question is causing distress and worse in the American Church where, as Dr Shepherd says, "the deepest feelings and emotions" have been aroused over it. Is it not worth a very great deal to avoid such a contingency in our own Church? If this is to be done it is quite essential that preparation for the change by enlightening both priesthood and laity about intinction should begin without delay. Of the three methods mentioned by Dr Shepherd the second is the best, wherein "the priest alone dips the Bread into the Wine and places the intincted wafer in the mouth" (on the tongue is better) "of the communicant". In any case the priest must pick up the Bread, and obviously the rest of the action should be his responsibility and not a very much scattered and divided one. This method must be good and practicable in itself for, apart from the dipping, it is employed for the many millions of communicants in the Roman Catholic Church. The first method, where the Bread is delivered into the hand of the communicant so that he may make his own intinction, cannot be accepted, for there is no guarantee that the many hands even in winter will not be more or less perspiring and uncleansed. For the wafer after such handling to be dipped in the Chalice is far from hygienic. The third method need not be con-

sidered, as it was "particularly condemned", and for good reason, by the Liturgical Commission itself.

Dr Shepherd mentions that "it was the influenza epidemic that swept the country towards the close of the First World War that brought into widespread use in parishes all over the land the custom of receiving communion by intinction". Are we not blameworthy if we think that no such visitation and consequent demand will ever in a more sensitive age than the present and in a nearer future than we may think be upon us? As a matter of fact, all the ingredients for a change are with us already, and we seriously fail in duty if we do not make the necessary preparation by educating our people for it.

May I be allowed to mention that for any who wish to pursue the matter further , I have tried to deal with it from all points in a small monograph which is still available.[1]

Yours sincerely,
T. GRIGG-SMITH.

YELVERTON VICARAGE,
DEVON.

NATIONAL SERVICE AND THE ORDINAND

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The Dean of King's College, London, in November expressed the hope that his article might stimulate discussion. May I make the following points?

(i) When the Dean dealt with the exaggeration of the benefits of National Service for the ordinand, he pointed out that "many seem to have insulated themselves against service life. . . ." My first reaction was to ask: What have the Selection Conferences been up to? From my own experience of them, I should have thought that such an insulation from life would have been spotted in the candidate and resulted in a "not recommended" on the grounds of inadequate pastoral concern, or at least a recommendation conditional upon the candidate's spending a year in an occupation designed to bring him into living contact with his fellows.

(ii) Such conditional recommendations (and they are fairly frequent) come very near to what the Dean calls a "self-conscious seeking of experience for its own sake": but surely this is inevitable when we are dealing with one who is found to be retreating from experience. What would probably be helpful is for C.A.C.T.M. to readjust, in the light of the cessation of National Service, the stages in his career at which a candidate is finally selected. This might make difficulties for obtaining training grants from L.E.A.'s, but they would be the first to appreciate the importance of experience of life as a preparation for the ministry. The Dean's emphasis on social service is surely relevant here—in the old days, work for

[1] *Intinction* (Grosvenor Press, Blackfriars Road, Portsmouth, 2s. 6d., plus postage. [Reviewed in THEOLOGY, July 1950, p. 279.]

college missions and camps for the unemployed were undertaken as an avenue of service without thought of "gaining experience".

(iii) In other spheres, such as the training of apprentices in industry, powers of leadership and a sense of adventure are undoubtedly developed in the tough exercises of the Outward Bound School type. The idea of work camps is being developed by the S.C.M.-in-Schools. This kind of activity could be a way in which many might be able to test their vocation, and some might find it.

(iv) In almost every discussion about training, whether academic or pastoral, we reach a point where we hope to stop a gap by reference to "the wise direction of a first vicar". In ideal circumstances, such direction means everything to the young deacon or priest. But even with the help of good post-ordination training schemes, we have to recognize that it is by no means a certain factor in these days. So many of the potentially best "first vicars" are so overworked that they cannot arrange much work to be done in double harness so that the young can learn from the old. Our staffing position remains such that often the man with one curate ought to have two before he can do his best for his curates. This underlines again the need for maturity and experience of life in the candidate. The mere absence of National Service could increase the number of very young green curates: this must be avoided at all costs.

Yours faithfully,
D. R. Vicary.

Headmaster's House,
King's School,
Rochester.

EUCHARISTIC INDIVIDUALISM?

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Last year Canon Southcott's *The Parish Comes Alive* published the novel idea that the House Celebration is the Eucharist *par excellence* for weekdays. Now, *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England* gives its blessing to the not-so-novel idea that the Parish Communion is the Eucharist *par excellence* for Sundays. The Liturgical Commission's memorandum refers to "the individualism which . . . finds its natural expression in the quiet early celebration of Holy Communion without the 'distracting' presence of too many other communicants" (p. 22), and Canon Southcott quotes approvingly an article by Dr J. A. T. Robinson in which occurs the phrase "the present individualistic low mass" (p. 73). The two publications, in conjunction, would appear to give weighty expression to the notion that Low Mass in church, stricken with the disease of individualism, can no longer be expected to manifest a healthy koinonia/corporateness. In the October issue of Theology Dr J. G. Davies draws attention to the "fact" that in the Parish Communion koinonia may, so to say, reach saturation point. "It is an undeniable

fact of experience that where two or three hundred are gathered together, the sense of koionia, with all that this means in terms of personal encounter, as distinct from mob psychology, becomes more difficult of attainment" (p. 414). Perhaps we are meant to infer from this that where two or three *thousand* are gathered together, as at a High Mass during a Roman Catholic congress, koinonia is likely to be swamped in mob psychology. May I offer the following comments?

(1) My own conviction after ten years' ministry among small Protestant communities abroad is that true Christian fellowship in such communities is found more often than not among just those members who make their Communion Sunday by Sunday at Low Mass. I do not claim that Low Mass in church is a "must" for all seeking to heighten their sense of koinonia, but it may well be the best eucharistic method for (*a*) those who find their knowledge of the Faith and of its demands growing and deepening by means of meditation and private reading rather than by hearing sermons; and (*b*) those inhibited by nature from appreciating the Commission's discovery "that hymn-singing has become the backbone of popular worship" (p. 28). I wonder if Canon Southcott, in the initial stages of his experiment, found it necessary or helpful to distinguish between regular and irregular communicants among his congregation at Halton. Was it the "early morners" who pioneered with him? Or did they crab his ideas?

(2) As for individualism, the communicant at Low Mass has for years been warned of this danger and counselled, "Do not pray at the Mass; pray the Mass." What counsel, may I ask, have our liturgists to offer to the worshippers at the Parish Communion/House Celebration as a safeguard against mob psychology or mere gregariousness?

(3) Our attitude to our Roman brethren's experience of koinonia seems to be somewhat insular, to say the least. The memorandum ventures to pronounce judgment on their present attainment of corporateness (with a rather dubious placing of verbs)—"the Romans may be said to be recovering what the Anglican Church gained at the Reformation" (p. 23). I must confess that these words affected me paranormally: I had a brief glimpse of the Roman Liturgical Movement catching up with Minneapolis and, flushed with corporateness, demanding instant revision of the First Precept to read "to hear *either* Missa Cantata *or* High Mass".

(4) Far from wishing to discourage these most interesting and exciting experiments in Anglican worship, I give thanks for such evidences of pastoral zeal *provided* enthusiasm does not outpace truth and disparage that form of the Eucharist which has always inspired and still inspires the instructed Anglican, however individualistic he may appear to amateur psychologists. But I trust we shall not be in too great a hurry to leave terra firma and go rocketing after Dr Robinson's "theological kite", namely, "the present individualistic Low Mass must become gradually superseded by a number of house

celebrations, most probably in the evening". Personally, I have no desire to find myself in some rarish twi-lit upper-atmosphere, going round and round in giddy circles.

Yours faithfully,
I. Lewis.

Casa de Huespedes,
Minas de Rio Tinto,
Spain.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Christian Philosophy of St Thomas Aquinas. By Etienne Gilson. With a catalogue of St Thomas's works by I. T. Eschmann, O.P. Translated by I. K. Shook, C.S.B. Victor Gollancz. 42s.

This book is an English version of the fifth edition (1948) of M. Etienne Gilson's *Le Thomisme*, long familiar to Thomist students—the first edition appeared in 1920—as one of the best expository manuals of Thomist philosophy ever written. Of medievalists M. Gilson is to-day the *doyen*, and the present work embodies his most mature reflexions on the mind of the Angelic Doctor. The English title may be thought question-begging. Is St Thomas's a *Christian* philosophy, or merely Aristotle's quite evidently *non*-Christian philosophy adopted, with some sleight of hand, to Christian theological purposes? The author has had little to add to the last French edition beyond his discovery of the long-forgotten commentary of the Spanish Dominican Bañes on the first part of the *Summa Theologiae*. "My reading of this commentary confirms my hope", he tells us, "that my fancy had not been deceiving me, for I had merely rediscovered in the twentieth century what had been known at least since the sixteenth." Not that Bañes' interpretations at all points meet with his approval: e.g. the view that in a substance, as St Thomas understands it, accidents could have an *esse* of their own. Nevertheless, it is Gilson's opinion that Bañes is "by far the most Thomistic of all the Thomists whom it is my privilege to know". He cannot, however, say, what others may say for him, that he himself is a commentator second to none. The quasi-official commentary of Cajetan is dismissed with justice, as being "as misleading as it is painstaking". Whatever Cajetan's virtues may be, they include neither acumen nor lucidity.

M. Gilson's book falls into three sections, devoted to the Thomist conceptions of, respectively, God, nature and morality. The first deals with the metaphysics of existence and the problem of theism—the supposed proofs and attributes of God; the second, with an analysis of the idea of nature, discussing in turn creation, causality and man—his intellect and knowledge, his will and his appetites; the third, with St Thomas's moral theology—the human act, habits, the virtues and the vices and the laws governing human behaviour, personal, social and religious. The reader needs to pay close attention

throughout, but to its subject he will find no clearer or more comprehensive introduction. Gilson's veneration for St Thomas is profound. "I am more convinced," he states, "than ever that the basic metaphysical positions of Thomas Aquinas are still far ahead of what is considered most progressive in the philosophical thought of our times. Personally, I do not say of Thomas that he was right, but that he *is* right. . . . All the metaphysical truths contained in other doctrines acquire a still deeper truth in the light of Thomism." One may not, even without being anti-metaphysical, share M. Gilson's enthusiasm, although the Thomist synthesis can hardly fail to evoke admiration in the least sympathetic of critics; but there can be no question as to the learning and scholarly detachment which over a lifetime he has brought to his task. When he claims that this conviction has not been a preconceived principle guiding his historical study but is its conclusion, we are to believe him. The result here given is in fact scholarship at its best: patient, laborious and exact, yet visionary in its sweep and scope and poetic in its subdued fervour.

The translation is well done, though the work of englishing the author's scholastic-latinized French must have presented peculiar difficulties. Happily the lengthy periods of the original have been broken up into shorter English sentences. The result is a readability —transatlanticisms being generally unobtrusive—not always to be enjoyed in renderings from a foreign tongue in works of this type.

The appendix contains an exhaustive fifty-seven page catalogue of St Thomas's writings, especially prepared for this edition by an eminent Thomist bibliographer. The author's notes comprise a further fifty-five pages, and there are full indices.

Bernard M. G. Reardon.

Kelly, Devon.

Church Dogmatics, Vol. II, 1: The Doctrine of God. By Karl Barth. T. and T. Clark. 55s.

In this half-volume containing Chapter V, "The Knowledge of God", and Chapter VI, "The Reality of God", the author enlarges on the position already outlined for English readers in the early chapters of his Gifford lectures. In particular, Chapter V is crucial for our understanding of his thought. Our knowledge of God is declared to be bound to his "sacramental" revelation of himself in his Word, through the Holy Spirit. In respect of the primary objectivity of God himself the objectivity of his Word is secondary, but still wholly God-determined. Mysticism of any kind, on the one hand, and an apologetic which starts from the comparative study of religion, on the other, are ruled out of court. While "natural theology" is conceded to have a certain validity, it is rigidly excluded from the Christian proclamation and regarded as of no relevance to biblical theology.

The reader may well ask whether the excursus which pulverizes Roman scholasticism is not somewhat inadequate in its examination and intemperate in its tone. The manner in which biblical passages, regarded by students of a different school as justifying a natural

theology, are cudgelled into line with the author's thesis is a by no means isolated, though hardly commendable, example of the Barthian treatment of Scripture. And how far, we may well ask, is Barth himself, consciously or unconsciously, dependent on the mode of reasoning which he repudiates, but has nevertheless in part inherited through a post-scholastic Calvinism? A statement such as, "Because and as God is one, unique and simple, he is for this reason omnipresent", hardly excludes human judgment. Perhaps the most cogent question that one can ask Barth along the line of his own presuppositions is: Has he, in spite of the radically Christocentric character of his thought, really dealt with the proposition that the divine Word, while Lord of human history, has at the same time in becoming flesh submitted himself to history's verdict? If this be true, then every human search for knowledge, from botany to nuclear fission, from the way of the mystics to linguistic philosophy, has each in varying measure its relevance and cogency for our knowledge of God. To erect a bastion of supposedly biblical theology which claims to be impregnable to all this is, to say the least, misguided.

Such doubts, however, must not lead us to ignore the excellencies of these chapters. Their thesis is most likely to provoke disagreement in what it excludes and denies: the affirmations may well call for the whole-hearted assent. The excursuses in which various schools of thought are examined are often mines of information and the recurring interpretations of Reformed doctrine are particularly valuable. In one of these excursuses, occuring in the section entitled "The Being of God as One who Loves", there is an important discussion of the sense in which we may speak of God as "personal". This should be read with the author's exposition elsewhere of the doctrine of the Trinity. In another passage towards the end of the book he gives us a revealing, if rather involved, apologia for his own theological pilgrimage and justifies his modification of some eschatological statements which he made in his commentary on Romans. Altogether, Chapter VI in its analysis of the being and perfections of God, never allowing for one moment a separation of God's self-manifestation from his reality, still further substantiates Barth's claim to be the greatest theological architect of our time. But the thirty-year-old question about the soundness of the foundations of the fortress he is constructing still needs to be asked.

T. S. Garrett.

Tirumaraiyur.

History and Eschatology. By Rudolf Bultmann. Edinburgh University Press. 15s.

A Commentary on Mark Thirteen. By G. R. Beasley-Murray. Macmillan. 18s.

Both these books are about eschatology, a subject on which fools rush into print, whereas the angels, according to the N.T., are more modest in their claims to knowledge. It behoves us to tread warily.

First of all, it can hardly be denied that some of the N.T. writers

expected the end of the world to come soon, that is, during their own lifetime. This raises the question, Did Jesus also believe this? and here the writers divide. Dr Beasley-Murray is one of those who think that Jesus *did* believe that the end of this age would come during the lifetime of *this generation*, and that in fact he was wrong.

Dr Beasley-Murray goes further than many who agree with him up to this point, and thinks that Mark 13. 5–37 may be a fairly accurate report of the answer which Jesus gave to the question of the disciples, in Mark 13. 4, all on one and the same occasion. Dr Beasley-Murray dealt with the critical problems in his earlier book *Jesus and the Future* (1954) (reviewed THEOLOGY, October 1954, pp. 390 ff.); now he gives us a commentary on Mark 13 in the light of his critical position.

First, however, he gives us a summary of the arguments in the previous book, so that this volume can stand on its own. Then he prints the Greek text, usually a verse at a time, and this is followed by commentary and notes. There is also a detached note on the history of the interpretation of the *ΒΔΕΛΥΓΜΑ ΕΡΗΜΩΣΕΩΣ*, in which he argues that it refers to the Roman army and the ensigns and is a prophecy of the events which happened in A.D. 70.

The commentary is very clear and readable, and full of references to earlier work on the subject. (Is the word "inconcinnity" on p. 108 a misprint?) But it leaves unanswered a further question, If Jesus and the N.T. writers were wrong about the imminent second coming, are we compelled to continue to believe in a second coming at all, together with all the eschatological paraphernalia? For *one* answer to this question, we may turn to the other book, Bultmann's Gifford Lectures for 1955.

I shall not conceal the fact that I find these lectures extremely difficult to understand, so perhaps the best thing will be if I begin by attempting to show in outline what they are about, and then come on to the answer which they give to the problem of eschatology.

In the first lecture, Bultmann shows how the understanding of man's "historicity" (i.e. being at the mercy of the course of history) has raised the question, What is the essence and meaning of history? History has seemed to become sociology; man has become a passive object, a ball moved by the waves.

In the second lecture, he reviews the understanding of history in the era before Christ: myths, sagas, chronicles, historical narratives, Greek and Latin historians, the historians of ancient Israel. Of these last he says:

> If there is an interest in knowledge, it is in self-knowledge, and the historian calls his people to self-knowledge in reminding them of the deeds of God in the past and of the conduct of the people. This call is at the same time a call to responsibility in face of the future which will bring welfare or destruction, the blessing of God or chastisement. Therefore, historiography is not a means of education for politicians [cf. Polybius] but a sermon to the people. Looking back into the past means critically examining the past in order to warn the present (pp. 18 f.).

In Lecture III, "The Understanding of History from the Stand-

point of Eschatology", he summarizes western cosmic mythology, O.T. prophecy, the apocalyptic of later Judaism and of the N.T. with its expectation of the imminent end of the world. Lecture IV, "The Problem of Eschatology (A)", shows how Paul and John interpreted this iminent hope in the light of the non-occurrence of the end, and how the Church neutralized it through sacramentalism.

Lecture V continues this line of thought, the secularizing of eschatology in Idealism and Materialism (Vico, Kant, Hegel, Voltaire, Turgot, Condorcet, Comte, Proudhon); and VI has as its sub-title "The Abandonment of the Question of Meaning in History" (Burckhardt, Flaubert, Baudelaire, Spengler, Vico, Herder, Toynbee). At the end of this lecture he raises the question, What is the real subject of History? and goes on, in VII, to begin to argue that the answer is Man. Here he reviews the Greek understanding of Man, the biblical, the idealist and the romantic.

VIII and IX are entitled "The Nature of History", and the important point (for the main argument of the book) is what Bultmann calls the existential encounter with history. Here R. G. Collingwood is expounded, and Dilthey, Groce and Jaspers.

In the final lecture, X, "Christian Faith and History", Bultmann expounds his own understanding of history, and of the proper meaning of eschatology. These words, which are the conclusion of the book, may suggest what this understanding is:

> Man who complains: "I cannot see meaning in history, and therefore my life, iterwoven in history, is meaningless", is to be admonished: do not look around yourself into universal history, you must look into your own personal history. Always in your present lies the meaning in history, and you cannot see it as a spectator, but only in your responsible decisions. In every moment slumbers the possibility of being the eschatological moment. You must awaken it (p. 155).

Bultmann would not have us expect a second coming and an end of the world. The end comes when Jesus Christ is preached, and man believes, and is a new creature in Christ (p. 151).

The argument is very concisely stated (in 155 pages), and, as this review may have shown, surveys the ideas of a great many writers on history; but there is an excellent index of names and subjects, which helps the reader to retrace his steps when he has missed a point. Many will find such help essential.

John C. Fenton.
Wentworth,
Rotherham.

Cathedral and Crusade: Studies of the Medieval Church, 1050–1350. By H. Daniel Rops. Dent. 45s.

This volume is the third of a series in which the author proposes to detail singlehanded the whole history of the Christian Church. In an age so dominated by the specialist, the scheme is a refreshing one, but the unreasonable speed at which the author is carrying out so exacting a task (a volume every two years) involves him almost inevitably in either reading or thinking too little.

In the present volume none can complain of any lack of interest-

ing information, which will enlighten the professional as well as the amateur. The author deals with social, artistic and intellectual matters as well as with the more obvious sides of Church history. He frankly admits certain obvious blemishes of medieval life and his book is clearly planned and lucidly written.

But the work falls very far short of being an ideal textbook. This is partly due to his wearisome habit of exalting the French contribution to the medieval culture in season and out of season at the expense of giving an overall picture. Thus there is no methodical study of the growth of medieval universities. The great importance of Italy here is not brought out, Oxford and Cambridge are dismissed in a few words and attention is largely concentrated on the university of Paris, which "may be considered typical" (p. 308).

But the signal defect of the book lies in its unexpectedly antiquated approach to the middle ages. It has singularly little of that freshness of mind which characterizes so much of French Catholic scholarship and far too much of that boring and effete conservatism which one expects at Westminster Cathedral but not in the Académie Française. The day has long gone past when church history could be effectively considered without studying contemporary economic developments. M. Rops plays only the slightest attention to these, and as a result is completely unconvincing when he assesses the influence of the Church on social problems such as slavery and the growth of population. Until the inter-war period, Western Christians could rightly be charged with having largely ignored the existence of the Eastern Church. French scholars have done so much to remedy this situation that it is suprising to find M. Rops presenting a picture of Orthodoxy which verges on the ludicrous. He shows little appreciation of the high state of Byzantine life until it was irreparably weakened by one of the most scandalous acts ever committed by the Western Church. He holds the outmoded idea that the dispute between East and West in 1054 created a schism (pp. 393, 394, 425, but cf. 396), though Dr Runciman is by no means the first to point out that "the legates in 1054 had no legal standing" and "this interpretation did not become fixed in Western minds for more than a century to come" (*The Eastern Schism*, p. 50). The blame for the breach is put, of course, entirely on the Eastern side—"One man's ambition brought about the rupture; Michael Caerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople" (p. 393)—as against the informed judgment of Runciman: "At least equal blame for the events of 1054 must be assigned to Cardinal Humbert" (op. cit., p. 54). Later differences between East and West are simply dismissed as "trashy" (p. 396).

Some of this misrepresentation of the great Church of Christendom, from which the West derived so much of its early culture, would have been avoided if the author had got to the bottom of the thorny problem of the Gregorian Reform movement which constitutes the most influential and controversial factor in the Church history of this period. But he shows no sense of the undoubted novelty of much which the Gregorians claimed and the considerable amount of historical precedent which lay on the side of the conservative church-

men. Those who, like Sigebert of Gembloux, found Gregory's ban on the laity's attendance at masses said by married clergy "a new precedent and, as it seemed to many, a thoughtless prejudice contrary to the opinion of the holy fathers", had weighty support before and after their own day, and the Roman Catholic cause is unlikely to be advanced by ignoring their arguments and writing off marriage of the clergy as fornication (e.g. pp. 117, 124, 125, 175). Thus, though the book has some useful factual information, its lack of understanding is likely to limit its appeal to the hidebound.

The translation has been well done and the proofs carefully read, but the publishers' decision to omit completely a most useful bibliography is deplorable.

J. C. Dickinson.
Pembroke College,
Cambridge.

Marriage and the Unconscious. By Edward F. Griffith. Secker and Warburg. 21s.

This book is concerned primarily with the emotional problems that frequently lead to the breakdown of marriages. It begins with four typical case-histories which are the modern equivalent of some aspects of the parable and its exegesis. Dr Griffith is, of course, a well-known writer and speaker on marital problems, and it is of interest to note his own progress towards an increasing realization of the deep emotional rather than practical difficulties that make for differences between husband and wife. Stable marriages are usually between mature adults who can learn to understand and tolerate their own and their partner's weaknesses as well as their good qualities. Childish attitudes, a need for dependency as on parents, fears of sexuality (that may be covered up by a coquettish manner), are a few of the personal problems that can make for marital difficulties. It is remarkable how often marriages seem to repeat the pattern of parental miseries and seem destined to fail from the very beginning. The breakdown of a marriage is often a symptom rather than a cause of mental ill-health, but occurring relatively late in the course of the disorder. By the time the case gets to the divorce courts, one partner, if not both, has usually gone so far that they are unable or unwilling to accept the implications of psychological treatment. This naturally raises problems of prophylaxis which are very difficult to solve, since they depend on changing the attitude of adults to the handling of their children.

A second but related theme in this book is a study of Christ's sayings on marriage. Dr Griffith is concerned to point out the positive aspects of his teaching—"For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall cleave to his wife and they twain shall be one flesh" could hardly put more strongly the need for emotional maturity. Christian teaching on sex seems often to be geared to the level of repressing adolescent anxieties of dawning sexual tensions. Too often the reproduction of children has been over-emphasized as the sole aim of marriage, with impoverishment of the relation of man and wife and a tendency to belittle the status of women. It is a pity that

the word love has become so debased that it no longer means (amongst other things) the positive, adult giving of understanding and tolerance. Dr Griffith's is one amongst the increasing number of books in recent years that try to give a less negative view of sex, and it is better than most in showing how deep-rooted are the resistances to maturity in so many cases. It also shows how reading another sex book is not likely to help the more seriously disturbed patient who needs the personal relationship of the psycho-therapist in order to understand himself or herself—a point that is again a return to an aspect of Christ's way of teaching and influencing men and women.

This book should certainly be read by those who may have to deal with marriage problems in their daily work. Appendices contain useful references to other books, some legal aspects and the organizations connected with marriage welfare.

D. A. Pond.

Revelation and Reason in Islam. By A. J. Arberry. G. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

In this book Dr Arberry, Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, reviews the tradition of Islam with regard to a problem which recurs in nearly all the great religions of the world, namely, the relation between discoveries made by human reason and truths for which the claim is made that they have been revealed by supernatural revelation.

In Islam, "Revelation" is given primarily through a Book, rather than (as in most types of Christianity) primarily through a Person; and the verbal inspiration of the Holy Koran by God, as spoken by him in Arabic to the Prophet Muhammad, is an essential dogma of the Faith. But in practice this has been modified in two directions.

On the one hand, the principle that "nothing is better than Truth" has led some Muslims to look for guidance to sources outside the Koran. For instance, the Persian philosopher Rhazes (tenth century A.D.) says that his passion for knowledge led him to read every book that he could lay hands on, whether orthodox or not (pp. 34–9). Such an attitude naturally tends to make Reason, rather than Koranic Revelation, the ultimate judge of Truth.

Along another line, the Sufis, by their insistence on the supreme validity of mystical experience, tended to appeal to this, rather than to the Written Word of the Koran, as the ultimate standard in matters of religion. This sometimes led to a "deification" of the individual mystic in language even more extravagant than the Vedic *Tat tvam asi* ("That [God] thou [man] art"). Abu Zazid ("Bayazid") proclaimed: "Glory to Me! There is no god but I!" (pp. 97 f.). In face of claims such as these, the revealed Word of God in the Koran cannot but be relegated to a secondary place.

Thus, in Islam, orthodoxy has had to defend itself against Rationalism on the one hand and Mysticism on the other. The history of the Christian Church offers interesting parallels to this; and Professor Arberry maintains that "The true nature of the conflict or concord between reason and revelation will not be seized by those

who confine their curiosity to its manifestation in Christianity alone, or in Judaism alone, or in Islam alone"; while he also recognizes that "Each system of beliefs resting upon faith in a Divine revelation introduces its own set of variations" (pp. 7 ff). He himself does not here offer us any solution of the problem. Perhaps he feels the time is not ripe for this; for he closes with a quotation from Iqbal, which suggests that the revival of Islam which the poet has sponsored may mark the beginning of a new chapter in this long conflict, the end of which we cannot yet foresee. E. C. Dewick.

Great Shelford,
Cambridge.

SHORTER NOTICES

Christian Worship. By Horton Davies. Religious Education Press. 5s.

This is written to provide a basis for study circles to study Christian worship, and is written against a background of ecumenical thought. Each short chapter ends with a few well-set questions for group discussions and also a little home-work.

The first chapter sets the worship of the Church firmly in the context of its Jewish origins. Like every other chapter, it is informative and up to date—the book is in fact a revised edition of one first published in 1946. Succeeding chapters give an account of the worship of the Orthodox Church, of the Roman Catholics, of the Church of England, and of the Free Churches: later chapters discuss a number of matters of general liturgical principle. Mr Davies does not conceal his own loyalty to the Free Churches, but succeeds in making an admirably detached and sympathetic approach to the other traditions and gives reasonable summaries of their merits and shortcomings. In the chapter describing Anglican worship, he includes an analysis of the eucharistic rite for which he says he is "indebted to the Rev. R. D. Richardson, compiler of the Harborne Liturgy, formerly Principal of Ripon Hall". The analysis is arbitrary, artificial and devoid of a sense of history, the one unfortunate lapse in a book which is otherwise excellent for its purpose. It is not a handbook for liturgical students: but the study circle which works through it will acquire a sound background of liturgical understanding.

Thanksgiving for Childbirth and Dedication of Parents. By W. G. Baker. Berean Press. 2s.

The Churches of Christ (Disciples) practise Believers' Baptism, and disapprove of the baptism of infants. In such circles there is a growing consciousness of the pastoral or evangelical opportunities which they consequently miss among young parents. So Mr Baker here provides an office (of no liturgical interest) to be used in the setting of Holy Communion, at which parents give thanks for the birth of their child and dedicate themselves to their parenthood. He

is careful to explain that the office is not to be understood as in any way intending to dedicate the child. E. C. WHITAKER.

KIRKBY-IN-FURNESS.

THE SECRET OF RADIANT LIFE. By W. E. Sangster. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

Dr Sangster has written a book round the text, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly". He has written with insight and with a wealth of practical illustration, particularly on the sins that prove a stumbling block to life. How widely can a bound and expanded tract be expected to commend itself? This tract is in no sense one for specialists, but is addressed to Everyman; it is a pity that the publishers should have to price it so highly.

The blemishes on the general excellence of the book arise from the difficulties of the Preacher turned Writer. Many things said in the pulpit are modified by voice and gesture to a pardonable exaggeration, pardonable because the hyperbole serves to bring out a proper emphasis. But in print the stark exaggeration is often unpardonable. Dr Sangster writes (p. 46), "And he, who made the foul-mouthed Peter radiant . . . could make you radiant too." "Foul-mouthed" is not a reasonable gloss on Mark 14. 71. H. C. WALLACE.

THE FAITH OF ISRAEL. By H. H. Rowley. S.C.M. Press. 18s.

This book is composed of a series of lectures given by Professor Rowley at the Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. Each lecture deals with a particular aspect of Israel's faith: "the Nature of God", "the Nature and Need of Man", etc.

The text is clear and straightforward, as one would expect in such lectures. The footnotes bear witness to that monumental reading for which the author is famous. These footnotes often contain items of out-of-the-way information, such as that the form "Jehovah" goes back beyond the sixteenth century, to the fourteenth, if not the thirteenth century A.D. (p. 53). On the other hand, it seems hardly necessary to produce quotations in two foreign languages to make the point that the teaching of Jeremiah and Ezekiel about individual responsibility was only a corrective to the false opposite emphasis of their day, and that this teaching did not render obsolete all thought of man as a member of society (p. 105).

However, Professor Rowley's book is largely valuable just for its continual reminder that the judgments of critical orthodoxy, as commonly accepted, are often exaggerations. For example, with regard to the originality of the prophets, he reminds us that the principle that God was a God who demanded justice was not a new principle first formulated by the prophets: rather "the whole weight of the prophets' word (about just dealing) lies just in the fact that men who used unjust measures ought to have known, and indeed, did know, that they were doing wrong" (p. 127).

The opening chapter on "Revelation and its Media" is, perhaps, the most valuable in the book. Here Rowley directs attention, as he has before, and as he rightly considers it relevant and important to do again, to the real claim of the biblical revelation to uniqueness. The strength of this claim lies in the combination in that revelation of "historical and personal factors which dovetail one into another" (p. 40). It lies in the combination of revelation mediated through prophetic personality and revelation mediated through historical event. An inspired man speaks God's will, an event gives the same message. And this is true of the New Testament as well as the Old: it is true of the Bible as a whole.

There is a delightful remark on page 37: "We are accustomed to think of priests as inherently evil." Is it the Old Testament scholar, or the President of the Baptist Union, here speaking?

E. L. Randall.

Ely Theological College.

Easter Island: A Stone Age Civilization of the Pacific. By Alfred Métraux. Andre Deutsch. 21s.

The Gospel and the Religions. International Missionary Council Research Pamphlet No. 5. By Walter Freytag. S.C.M. Press. 3s.

Almost everyone knows about the Kon-tiki expedition and Thor Heyerdahl's theory of the migration from Peru to Easter Island. Unfortunately its widespread publicity has tended to lead many to suppose that Heyerdahl's hypothesis is proven. Dr Alfred Métraux, the distinguished French anthropologist, thinks otherwise. His book, *Easter Island*, written for the general reader, at once combines a scholarly and a popular account of his researches in this particular island of the Pacific, now a "body without a soul", well known for its strange, gigantic statues. Says Métraux, "Their presence on this solitary and bare islet is as much of a riddle to-day as at the time when Roggeveen, the first European to contemplate them, wrote in his log". They have a "mass-produced appearance", and seem to be less ancient than some have imagined. They were probably not idols in the usual sense, but were connected in some way with the many mausolea of the island, perhaps as images of deified ancestors. The author is, however, chary of committing himself to any definite theory.

Not only does he give a fascinating account of the present-day Easter Islanders, but he also describes and discusses their religion and mythology, and gives his own view that the lost Easter Island civilization came from the Marquesas Islands in the twelfth century rather than direct from South America. The book contains several pages of photographs and a full bibliography. In the earlier chapters the reader cannot help being struck by the foolish and often cruel treatment of the native inhabitants by past European explorers and traders. The Christian West has a lot to live down.

Dr Walter Freytag's pamphlet *The Gospel and the Religions*, translated from the German, shows how the comparative study of

religions among Christian scholars has moved away from the old liberal approach towards a renewed understanding of the centrality of Christ in Christianity. There is nothing particularly new in this booklet; but it will be a welcome addition to the Church bookstall and to the parish study-group willing to get down to careful thinking about the relationship between Christianity and the other great religions, which are nowadays receiving so much publicity in the West.

D. W. Gundry.

University College of North Wales, Bangor.

Mastery and Mercy. By Philip M. Martin. O.U.P. 15s.

Having read T. S. Eliot's "Ash Wednesday" with little understanding, and never having read G. M. Hopkins' "The Wreck of the Deutschland", I felt hardly competent to review Canon Martin's book on these poems. But I was encouraged to read of his "hope that, under God, these slight essays may serve to open some doors of understanding and appreciation for some who may have turned aside from these poems as being not for them, and that the truth about God and Man which is so gloriously and movingly expressed may enter into them and make them free".

His book, then, is written for us who are inexpert in the interpretation of obscure poetry, but more than interested in "the truth about God and Man". We need more such books, not only at this somewhat rarefied level, but also even more popular essays on the religious, or more specifically the Christian, insights to be found in, say, Shakespeare or Dickens, as well as, say, Browning or Spenser.

Does Canon Martin succeed in his admirable purpose? He tells us that Hopkins, priest as well as poet, kept "his poet's tongue in disciplined silence for the first seven years of his priesthood". This silence he broke to write "The Wreck of the Deutschland". Canon Martin would persuade us that its "glory and passionate depth" proceed from the tension between the priest's self-discipline and the poet's imagination. Is it too naïve to raise the questions—Was this tension an artificially induced cause of obscurity? To what heights of mastery of language might Hopkins have attained if he had applied himself in those seven vital years to the poet's craft as within his vocation to priesthood? These are ultimately theological questions, involving the relation of the world-affirming to the world-negating elements in the Christian vocation. Those whose sympathies here are with Hopkins may well find Canon Martin more helpful than I could.

"Ash Wednesday" is different. There seems, to me at least, no question here of the poet's mastery of his craft. What we need is a not too exhaustive guide to the allusions in detail, set in the context of a sympathetic understanding of Eliot's exposition of repentance and forgiveness. Canon Martin does this most helpfully. Not least impressive is his final identification of himself with Eliot's forgiven penitent.

A. H. Dammers.

Sheffield.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

AUTHOR (HOLYWELL RECTORY, HUNTINGDONSHIRE): A. G. McL. Pearce Higgins, *Thirty-six Sonnets* (4s. 6d.).

A. AND C. BLACK: C. S. C. Williams, *The Acts of the Apostles* (25s.).

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: William Perin, O.P., *Spiritual Exercises* [translation of a Flemish work first published in 1557; issued in English in 1929] (10s. 6d.).

BLACKWELL: Leonard Hodgson, *For Faith and Freedom*, Vol. II (25s.).

BOWES AND BOWES: Daniel J. Theron, *Evidence of Tradition* [selections from pagan and early Christian writings to the time of Augustine] (25s.).

J. CLARKE AND CO.: F. H. Cleobury, *The Armour of Saul: a Reconsideration of the Easter Faith* (9s. 6d.).

COLLINS: W. B. J. Martin, *Five Minutes to Twelve* [extracts from the journal of "Peter Parson", contributor to *The British Weekly*] (10s. 6d.).

DARWEN FINLAYSON: Richard Hall and Eugene Beitler, *How to Read the Bible* [a simple guide for beginners] (9s. 6d.).

EPWORTH PRESS: John Knox, *The Early Church and the Coming Great Church* [reviewed in THEOLOGY, January 1956, p. 36] (12s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: John Macmurray, *The Self as Agent* (25s.); Josef Pieper, *The Silence of St Thomas* (12s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Gerald Ellison, Bishop of Chester, *The Churchman's Duty* [seven charges delivered at the primary visitation of the diocese of Chester] (7s. 6d.).

HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS: Lindsay Ride, *Robert Morrison, the Scholar and the Man* [a short biography, and illustrated catalogue of exhibition commemorating 150th anniversary of his arrival in China] (12s. 6d).

LONGMANS: Jeanne Ancelet-Hustache, *Master Eckhart and the Rhineland Mystics* (6s.); Claude Tresmontant, *Saint Paul and the Mystery of Christ* (6s.); Maurice Percheron, *Buddha and Buddhism* [an account of the life and teaching of Buddha and the subsequent development of Buddhism] (6s.); Romano Guardini, *The Living God* and *The Rosary of our Lady* (9s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Rudolf Obermuller, *Evangelism in Latin America* (2s.).

MARSHALL, MORGAN AND SCOTT: John F. Holliday, *Life from Above* (10s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Harold Riesenfeld, *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings* (2s. 6d.); *The Bible and the Christian* [a course of sermons preached at Pusey House] (3s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Raymond Abba, *Principles of Christian Worship* [on the conduct of public worship in the Free Churches by a Congregationalist] (10s. 6d.); Bruce M. Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* [an examination of the books of the Apocrypha, their history and significance, based on the R.S.V.] 28s.).

PENNSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): John Joseph Stoudt, *Sunrise to Eternity* (40s.).

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY INC.: Dagobert D. Runes, *A Book of Contemplation* [a collection of aphorisms] $3.00).

S.C.M. PRESS: William Neil, *St Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians* (10s. 6d.); E. C. Blackman, *The Epistle of James* (10s. 6d.); Ian T. Ramsey, *Religious Language* (18s.); W. A. Visser 't Hooft, *Rembrandt and the Gospel* (25s.).

SHEED AND WARD: D. J. B. Hawkins, *Crucial Problems of Modern Philosophy* (10s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Sir Wilfred Garrett, *Changing Industrial Relations* (2s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

LAMBETH YEAR 1958

International Summer Courses

AT

ST. AUGUSTINE'S, CANTERBURY

The Central College of the Anglican Communion

July 14—26 THE CHURCH AND THE LAITY
July 28—Aug. 9 THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY
Aug. 11—23 LAMBETH AND CHRISTIAN UNITY

Lecturers include: THE BISHOPS OF DERBY, KNARESBOROUGH, OLYMPIA (U.S.A.) and KURUNAGALA (Ceylon), CANON E. SOUTHCOTT (Halton), PROFESSORS R. H. FULLER (Evanston) and C. A. SIMPSON (Oxford), MR. PHILIP MAIRET (London), DR. MORAN WESTON (New York), and DR. H. H. WALZ (Germany).

Full details from:
The Secretary of the Summer Courses, St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, Kent

NOVUM GLOSSARIUM MEDIAE LATINITATIS

ab anno DCCC usque ad annum MCC

edendum curavit Consilium Acad. Consociatarum

Sponsored by the union Académique Internationale, this entirely new Dictionary of Medieval Latin, the result of some 35 years work, has begun to appear. The fascicule containing the letter "L", in 232 columns, is now ready, and the "Index Scriptorum", 194 pp., at the subscription price of £2 2s. 6d. and £4 5s. respectively. Altogether the work will, it is estimated, take about 4640 quarto pages. The rate of publication cannot for editorial reasons be accurately forecast, but it is intended to publish one or two fascicules yearly, the next being "M" and "N" (in 1958). Definitions are in French.

British Distributors
W. Heffer & Sons Ltd., Petty Cury, Cambridge

Books for Teachers

A Daily Service Book for the Junior School

R. R. Broackes **7s. 6d.**

The compiler is the Headmaster of a Primary School in Bath, and his book is the fruit of his experience and will be found helpful by many teachers responsible for School Assembly.

Worship and the Modern Child

A Book for Parents, Clergy and Teachers

John G. Williams **12s. 6d.**

Mr. Williams has many claims to give counsel. His experience has been wide—parish priest, broadcaster, expert educationalist, and—not least—parent. All who have the responsibility of leading children to the experience of worship will be grateful for his wise, down-to-earth advice.

Concise Bible Commentary

W. K. Lowther Clarke **30s. net**

"One cannot recommend too strongly Dr. Lowther Clarke's astounding Commentary."

Notes for the Assistance of Governors and Managers of Church Schools

J. C. Powell Price **3s. 6d.**

These notes, which were initiated by the Schools Council of the Church of England Council for Education, and written by the former Legal Secretary of the National Society, are based on the Acts, Statutory Instruments (such as the Schools Grants Regulations and the Building Regulations), Circulars, and Administrative Memoranda issued by the Ministry on various points. They should prove invaluable to every board of governors or managers, and every incumbent who has a Church school.